



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/399,696	09/21/1999	KEHSING J. CHOU	ST9-99-093	2558

7590

05/23/2002

SUGHRUE MION ZINN MACKEAK & SEAS
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20037-3213

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, TAM V

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2172

DATE MAILED: 05/23/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/399,696

Applicant(s)

CHOU ET AL.

Examiner

Tam V Nguyen

Art Unit

2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 March 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 21 November 2001 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang et al. (US 6263342B1) in view of Jindal et al. (US 6324580B1).

Re claims 1 and 13, Chang discloses a method of searching for data in one or more heterogeneous data sources within a computer system, the method comprising step of: receiving a request for data at a federated data source, (Col. 40, lines 38-Col. 41, lines 28 and see fig. 9)

Chang fails to show selecting a server to process the request based on a load of the server and based on whether the server can satisfy the request for data.

Jindal teaches selecting a server to process the request based on a load of the server and based on whether the server can satisfy the request for data, (Col. 6, lines 4-Col. 7, lines 21). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Chang by including selecting a server to

Art Unit: 2172

process the request based on a load of the server and based on whether the server can satisfy the request for data, as taught by Jindal, so the computer server capable of efficiently satisfying the needs of a limited number of clients, (Col. 1, lines 8-16).

Re claims 2, 8, and 14, Jindal discloses forwarding the request to the selected server, (Col. 6, lines 4-Col. 7, lines 21).

Re claims 3, 9, and 15, Jindal further discloses forwarding additional requests for similar data to the selected server, (Col. 6, lines 4-Col. 7, lines 21).

Re claims 4, 10, and 16, Chang discloses wherein the server is within a server hierarchy, (Col.8, lines 44-Col. 9, lines 48).

Re claims 5, 11, and 17, Chang further discloses upon receiving a request to add another server, connecting the server to an existing server in the server hierarchy based on a number of connections of the existing server, (Col.8, lines 44-Col. 9, lines 48).

Re claims 6, 12, and 18, Chang further discloses upon receiving a request to delete an existing server in the hierarchy, deleting that server, (Col.8, lines 44-Col. 9, lines 48).

Art Unit: 2172

Re claim 7, Chang discloses an apparatus for searching for data in one or more heterogeneous data sources, comprising: a computer system having one or more heterogeneous data sources, (Col. 40, lines 38-Col. 41, lines 6 and see fig. 9).

Chang fails to show one or more computer programs, performed by the computer system, for receiving a request for data at a federated data source and selecting a server to process the request based on a load of the server and based on whether the server can satisfy the request for data.

Jindal teaches one or more computer programs, performed by the computer system, for receiving a request for data at a federated data source and selecting a server to process the request based on a load of the server and based on whether the server can satisfy the request for data, (Col. 6, lines 4-Col. 7, lines 21). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Chang by including one or more computer programs, performed by the computer system, for receiving a request for data at a federated data source and selecting a server to process the request based on a load of the server and based on whether the server can satisfy the request for data, as taught by Jindal, so the computer server capable of efficiently satisfying the needs of a limited number of clients, (Col. 1, lines 8-16).

Contact Fax Information

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Art Unit: 2172

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or Faxed to:

(703) 746-7239, (for formal communication intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 746-7240, (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA. Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Contact Information

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tam Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-3735. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Yen Vu, can be reached on (703) 305-4393. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-5399.

5. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

TV: tv

05/16/02



**KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**